REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of February 4, 2010, claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected. Additionally, claims 6 and 11-14 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determination that claims 6 and 11-14 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 6 and 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At this time, Applicants choose not to rewrite claims 6 and 11-14. Instead, Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are allowable based on the remarks below.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Amada et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,409,559, hereinafter "Amada"). Additionally, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Amada. Furthermore, claims 1-3 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,982,593, hereinafter "Robinson"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are neither anticipated by Amada nor obvious over Amada or Robinson for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

> "Digital amplifier for converting an input signal to a power output, comprising: a bridge circuit with at least one pair of switches; and a supply ripple pre-compensation circuit for compensating voltage ripples on a supply voltage supplied to the bridge circuit; wherein the supply ripple pre-compensation circuit compensates the voltage ripples on the supply voltage based on the input signal." (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*Digital amplifier for converting an input signal to a power output*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*a bridge circuit with at least one pair of switches*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*a supply ripple pre-compensation circuit for compensating voltage ripples on a supply voltage supplied to the bridge circuit*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Because Amada does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Amada.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*Digital amplifier for converting an input signal to a power output*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Amada discloses a power supply controlled stereophonic amplifier system. (See Fig. 6, column 4, lines 43-45, and column 5, lines 7-28 of Amada). Amada further discloses that the amplifier system includes two channels, a D.C. power supply (8), and a DC-DC converter (9). (See Fig. 6, column 4, lines 43-45, and column 5, lines 7-28 of Amada). Amada also discloses that one channel includes an input signal source (31), a pre-amplifier (32), output transistors (33) and (34), a loud speaker (35), a full-wave rectifying circuit (36), and an analog logic circuit (37). (See Figs. 3 and 6, column 2, lines 22-26, and column 5, lines 7-28 of Amada). Additionally, Amada discloses that another channel includes an input signal source (1), a pre-amplifier (2), output transistors (3) and (4), a

loud speaker (5), a full-wave rectifying circuit (12), and the analog logic circuit (37). (See Figs. 3 and 6, column 2, lines 22-26, and column 5, lines 7-28 of Amada).

However, Amada does not disclose that any of the input signal sources (1) and (31), pre-amplifiers (2) and (32), the output transistors (3), (4), (33) and (34), the loud speakers (5) and (35), the full-wave rectifying circuits (36), the analog logic circuit (37), the D.C. power supply (8) and the DC-DC converter (9) is a digital circuit. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Amada does not disclose a digital amplifier as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*a bridge circuit with at least one pair of switches*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Office Action suggests that the output transistors (3), (4), (33) and (34) of Amada are equivalent to the "*bridge circuit*" of claim 1. (See page 2 of the Office Action). However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully assert that Amada is completely silent as to a bridge circuit. Specifically, Amada does not disclose that the output transistors (3), (4), (33) and (34) form a bridge circuit. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that the output transistors (3), (4), (33) and (34) of Amada are not equivalent to the "*bridge circuit*" of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose "*a supply ripple pre-compensation circuit for compensating voltage ripples on a supply voltage supplied to the bridge circuit*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Amada discloses that a signal compressor circuit (127) is located between the input signal sources (1) and (31) and a pulse wide modulation (PWM) converter (13). The Office Action suggests that the signal compressor circuit (127) of Amada is equivalent to the "*supply ripple pre-compensation circuit for compensating voltage ripples on a supply voltage supplied to the bridge circuit*" of claim 1. (See page 2 of the Office Action). However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Amada discloses that the signal compressor circuit (127) compresses input signals from the input signal sources (1) and (31) and supplies the compressed input signals to the PWM converter (13). (See Figs. 6, 13 and 15 and column 7, lines 30-52 of Amada).

That is, Amada discloses that the signal compressor circuit (127) compresses signals. However, Amada does not disclose that the signal compressor circuit (127) compensates voltage ripples on the input signals from the input signal sources (1) and (31). As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that the signal compressor circuit (127) of Amada is not equivalent to the "*supply ripple pre-compensation circuit for compensating voltage ripples on a supply voltage supplied to the bridge circuit*" (emphasis added) of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Amada does not disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1. Because Amada does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Amada.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Robinson does not constitute prior art for the current application. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the filling date of Robinson is later than the effective filing date of the current application. The current application claims priority from the parent European Patent Application, Application No. 03100920.2, filed on April 7, 2003. Thus, the effective filing date of the current application is April 7, 2003. Robinson was filed on October 23, 2003. Thus, the filling date of Robinson is later than the effective filing date of the current application. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that Robinson does not constitute prior art for the current application. Because Robinson does not constitute prior art for the current application, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not obvious over Robinson.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is neither anticipated by Amada nor obvious over Robinson.

Dependent Claims 2, 3 and 13

Claims 2, 3 and 13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 3 and 13 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Independent Claim 4

Claim 4 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 4 and independent claim 1, Applicants

respectfully submit that claim 4 is neither anticipated by Amada nor obvious over Robinson.

Dependent Claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5 and 6 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 4.

Independent Claim 7

Independent claim 7 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 7 and independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is neither anticipated by Amada nor obvious over Robinson.

Dependent Claims 8 and 14

Claims 8 and 14 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 7. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 8 and 14 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 7.

Independent Claim 9

Independent claim 9 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1. Because of the similarities between independent claim 9 and independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is neither anticipated by Amada nor anticipated by Robinson.

Dependent Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-12 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 9.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:

NXP N.V.

Date: March 29, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111